arXiv:0902.2467v1 [math.AC] 14 Feb 2009

Krull dimension of tensor products of pullbacks

Samir Bouchiba
Department of Mathematics, University Moulay Ismail, Meknes 50000, Morocco

Abstract

This paper is concerned with the study of the dimension theory of tensor products of algebras over a field k. We answer an open problem set in [6] and compute $\dim(A \otimes_k B)$ when A is a k-algebra arising from a specific pullback construction involving AF-domains and B is an arbitrary k-algebra. On the other hand, we deal with the question (Q) set in [5] and show, in particular, that such a pullback A is in fact a generalized AF-domain.

1. Introduction

All rings considered in this paper are commutative with identity element and all ring homomorphisms are unital. Throughout, k stands for a field. We shall use t.d.$(A : k)$, or t.d.(A) when no confusion is likely, to denote the transcendence degree of a k-algebra A over k, $A[n]$ to denote the polynomial ring $A[X_1, ..., X_n]$ and $p[n]$ to denote the prime ideal $p[X_1, ..., X_n]$ of $A[X_1, ..., X_n]$ for each prime ideal p of A. Also, we use Spec(A) to denote the set of prime ideals of a ring A and $\subset$ to denote proper set inclusion. All k-algebras considered throughout this paper are assumed to be of finite transcendence degree over k. Any unreferenced material is standard as in [11], [15], [16] and [17].

Several authors have been interested in studying the prime ideal structure and related topics of tensor products of algebras over a field k. The initial impetus for these investigations was a paper of R. Sharp on Krull dimension of tensor products of two extension fields. In fact, in [19], Sharp proved that, for any two extension fields K and L of k, $\dim(K \otimes_k L) = \min(\text{t.d.}(K), \text{t.d.}(L))$ (actually, this result appeared ten years earlier in Grothendieck's EGA [13, Remarque 4.2.1.4, p. 349]). This formula is rather surprising since, as one may expect, the structure of the tensor product should reflect the way the two components interact and not only the structure of each component. This fact is what most motivated Wadsworth's work in [20] on this subject. His aim was to seek geometric properties of primes of $A \otimes_k B$ and to widen the scope of algebras A and B for which $\dim(A \otimes_k B)$ depends only on individual characteristics of A and B. The algebras which proved tractable for Krull dimension computations turned out to be those domains A which satisfy the altitude formula over k (AF-domains for short), that is,

---

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): Primary 13C15; Secondary 13B24.
E-mail address: sbouchiba@hotmail.com

keywords: Krull dimension, tensor product, prime ideal, AF-domain.

$$ht(p) + \text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p}) = \text{ t.d.}(A)$$

for all prime ideals p of A. It is worth noting that the class of AF-domains contains the most basic rings of algebraic geometry, including finitely generated k-algebras that are domains. Wadsworth proved, via [20, Theorem 3.8], that if A_1 and A_2 are AF-domains, then

$$\dim(A_1 \otimes_k A_2) = \min\Big(\dim(A_1) + \text{t.d.}(A_2),\ \text{t.d.}(A_1) + \dim(A_2)\Big).$$

His main theorem stated a formula for $\dim(A \otimes_k B)$ which holds for an AF-domain A, with no restriction on B, namely:

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \dim(A \otimes_k B) & = & D\Big(\text{t.d.}(A), \dim(A), B\Big) \\ & := & \max\Big\{ht(q[\text{t.d.}(A)]) + \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(A),\ \dim(A) + \text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q})\Big) : q \in \text{Spec}(B)\Big\} \\ & & [20, \text{Theorem } 3.7]. \end{array}$$

Our aim in [6] was to extend Wadsworth's results in a different way, namely to tensor products of k-algebras arising from pullbacks. In this regard, we use previous deep investigations on prime ideal structure of various pullbacks, as in [1]. Our main result in [6] states the following:

Let T_i be a k-algebra which is an integral domain and M_i a maximal ideal of T_i such that $ht(M_i) = dim(T_i)$, $K_i = \frac{T_i}{M_i}$, φ_i the canonical surjection from T_i to K_i, D_i a subring of K_i, and $A_i = \varphi_i^{-1}(D_i)$ be the issued pullback, for $i = 1, 2$. Assume that T_i and D_i are AF-domains, for $i = 1, 2$. Then

$$dim(A_1 \otimes_k A_2) = max\Big\{ht(M_1[t.d.(A_2)]) + D\Big(t.d.(D_1),\ dim(D_1), R_2\Big),$$

$$ht(M_2[t.d.(A_1)]) + D\Big(t.d.(D_2),\ dim(D_2), R_1\Big)\Big\},$$

where $D(s, d, A) := \max\Big\{ht(p[s]) + \min\Big(s, d + \text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p})\Big) : p \in \text{Spec}(A)\Big\}$ for any k-algebra A and any positive integers $0 \leq d \leq s$. This theorem allows one to compute the Krull dimension of tensor product of two k-algebras for a large family of (not necessarily AF-domains) k-algebras. Further, we set in [6] the open problem of computing $\dim(A_1 \otimes_k A_2)$ when only T_1 and D_1 are assumed to be AF-domains.

On the other hand, in [14], Jaffard proved that, for any ring A and any positive integer n, the Krull dimension of $A[n]$ can be realized as the length of a special chain of $A[n]$. Recall that a chain $C = \{Q_0 \subset Q_1 \subset ... \subset Q_s\}$ of prime ideals of $A[n]$ is called a special chain if for each Q_i, the ideal $(Q_i \cap A)[n]$ belongs to C. Subsequently, Brewer et al. gave an equivalent and simple version of Jaffard's theorem. Actually, they showed that, for each positive integer n and each prime ideal P of $A[n]$, $ht(P) = ht(q[n]) + ht(\frac{P}{q[n]})$ [10, Theorem 1], where $q := P \cap A$. Taking into account the natural isomorphism $B[n] \cong k[n] \otimes_k B$ for each k-algebra B, we generalized in [6] this special chain theorem to tensor products of k-algebras. Effectively, we proved that if A and B are k-algebras such that A is an AF-domain, then for each prime ideal P of $A \otimes_k B$,

$$ht(P) = ht(A \otimes_k q) + ht(\frac{P}{A \otimes_k q}) = ht(q[\text{t.d.}(A)]) + ht(\frac{P}{A \otimes_k q}),$$

where $q = P \cap B$ (cf. [6, Lemma 1.5]). It turned out that this very geometrical property totally characterizes the AF-domains. In fact, we proved, in [4], that the following statements are equivalent for a domain A which is a k-algebra:

a) A is an AF-domain;

b) A satisfies SCT (for special chain theorem), that is, for each k-algebra B and each prime ideal P of $A \otimes_k B$ with $q := P \cap B$,

$$ht(P) = ht(q[t.d.(A)]) + ht(\frac{P}{A \otimes_k q}) = ht(A \otimes_k q) + ht(\frac{P}{A \otimes_k q}) \text{ [4, Theorem 1.1].}$$

In view of this, we generalized in [5] the AF-domain notion by setting the following definitions:

We say that a k-algebra A satisfies GSCT (for generalized special chain theorem) with respect to a k-algebra B if

$$ht(P) = ht(p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q) + ht(\frac{P}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q})$$
$$\text{for each prime ideal } P \text{ of } A \otimes_k B, \text{ with } p = P \cap A \text{ and } q = P \cap B,$$

and we call a generalized AF-domain (GAF-domain for short) a domain A such that A satisfies GSCT with respect to any k-algebra B.

There is no known example in the literature of a k-algebra A which is a domain and which is not a GAF-domain. This may lead one to ask whether any k-algebra which is a domain is a GAF-domain. We were concerned in [5] with the following question:

(Q): Is any domain A which is a k-algebra such that the polynomial ring $A[n]$ is an AF-domain, for some positive integer n, a GAF-domain?

We gave in [5] partial results settling in the affirmative the above question (Q). First, we proved that an AF-domain A is in fact a GAF-domain, thus in particular, any finitely generated algebra over k which is a domain is a GAF-domain. Also, we proved that (Q) has a positive answer in the case where A is one-dimensional. Our main result in [5] tackles the case $n = 1$ of (Q). It computes $\dim(A \otimes_k B)$ for a k-algebra A such that $A[X]$ is an AF-domain and for an arbitrary k-algebra B generalizing Wadsworth's main theorem [20, Theorem 3.7] and further asserts that A is a GAF-domain. We ended that paper by an example of a GAF-domain A such that, for any positive integer n, the polynomial ring $A[n]$ is not an AF-domain.

Our objective in this paper is twofold. On the one hand, we handle the above-mentioned problem set in [6] and compute $\dim(A \otimes_k B)$ when A is a pullback arising from the above construction and B is an arbitrary k-algebra. On the other hand, we prove that the answer to the question (Q) set in [5] is affirmative for such a pullback construction A. Besides, our main result, Theorem 2.8, is, in particular, an important step towards determining a general formula for $\dim(A \otimes_k B)$ in the case where $A[n]$ is an AF-domain for some positive integer n and B is an arbitrary k-algebra. It states the following:

Let T be a k-algebra which is a domain and M a maximal ideal of T. Let $K = \dfrac{T}{M}$ and D be a subring of K. Let $\varphi : T \longrightarrow K$ be the canonical surjective homomorphism and $A := \varphi^{-1}(D)$. Assume that T and D are AF-domains and T_M is catenarian. Then, A is a GAF-domain and for an arbitrary k-algebra B,

$$dim(A \otimes_k B) = \ max\Big\{D\Big(t.d.(A), d, B\Big); ht(M) + max\Big\{ht(q_1[t.d.(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[t.d.(D)]\Big) + min\Big(t.d.(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ t.d.(K:D)\Big) + min\Big(t.d.(D),\ dim(D) + t.d.(\frac{B}{q})\Big) : q_1 \subseteq q \in\ Spec(B)\Big\}\Big\},$$

where $d := \ sup\Big\{ht(Q) : Q \in Spec(T)\ with\ M \not\subset Q\Big\}.$

Direct consequences of this theorem are provided as well as a case where we may drop the catenarity property of T_M is exhibited. An example to illustrate our findings closes this paper.

Recent developments on height and grade of (prime) ideals as well as on dimension theory in tensor products of k-algebras are to be found in [2-7]. Concerning the study of the transfer to tensor products of algebras of the S-property, strong S-property, and catenarity, we refer the reader to [8].

2. Main results

First, for the convenience of the reader, we catalog some basic facts and results connected with the tensor product of k-algebras. These will be used frequently in the sequel without explicit mention.

Let A and B be two k-algebras. If p is a prime ideal of A, $r = \text{t.d.}(\dfrac{A}{p})$ and $\overline{x_1}, ..., \overline{x_r}$ are elements of $\dfrac{A}{p}$, algebraically independent over k, with the $x_i \in A$, then it is easily seen that $x_1, ..., x_r$ are algebraically independent over k and $p \cap S = \emptyset$, where $S = k[x_1, ..., x_r] \setminus \{0\}$. If

A is an integral domain, then $ht(p)+\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p}) \leq \text{t.d.}(A)$ for each prime ideal p of A (cf. [21, p. 37]). Now, assume that S_1 and S_2 are multiplicative subsets of A and B, respectively, then $S_1^{-1}A \otimes_k S_2^{-1}B \cong S^{-1}(A \otimes_k B)$, where $S = \{s_1 \otimes s_2 : s_1 \in S_1 \text{ and } s_2 \in S_2\}$. We assume familiarity with the natural isomorphisms for tensor products. In particular, we identify A and B with their respective images in $A \otimes_k B$. Also, $A \otimes_k B$ is a free (hence faithfully flat) extension of A and B. Moreover, recall that an AF-domain A is a locally Jaffard domain, that is, $ht(p[n]) = ht(p)$ for each prime ideal p and each positive integer n [20, Corollary 3.2]. Finally, we refer the reader to the useful result of Wadsworth [20, Proposition 2.3] which yields a classification of the prime ideals of $A \otimes_k B$ according to their contractions to A and B.

We begin by recalling from [3], [5], [6] and [20] the following useful results.

Proposition 2.1 [6, Lemma 1.3]. *Let A and B be k-algebras such that B is a domain. Let p be a prime ideal of A. Then, for each prime ideal P of $A \otimes_k B$ which is minimal over $p \otimes_k B$,*

$$ht(P) = ht(p \otimes_k B) = ht(p[t.d.(B)]).$$

Proposition 2.2 [20, Proposition 2.3]. *Let A and B be k-algebras and let $p \subseteq p'$ be prime ideals of A and $q \subseteq q'$ be prime ideals of B. Then the natural ring homomorphism $\varphi : \frac{A \otimes_k B}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q} \longrightarrow \frac{A}{p} \otimes_k \frac{B}{q}$ such that $\varphi(\overline{a \otimes_k b}) = \overline{a} \otimes_k \overline{b}$ for each $a \in A$ and each $b \in B$, is an isomorphism and*

$$\varphi(\frac{p' \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q'}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}) = \frac{p'}{p} \otimes_k \frac{B}{q} + \frac{A}{p} \otimes_k \frac{q'}{q}.$$

Proposition 2.3 [6, Lemma 1.2 and Proposition 2.2]. *Let T be an integral domain which is a k-algebra, M a maximal ideal of T, $K := \frac{T}{M}$ and $\varphi : T \rightarrow K$ the canonical surjective homomorphism. Let D be a proper subring of K and $A := \varphi^{-1}(D)$. Assume that T and D are AF-domains. Then*

1) The polynomial ring $A[t.d.(K : D)]$ is an AF-domain.

2) $ht(p[n]) = ht(p)+min\Big(n,\ t.d.(K : D)\Big)$ for each prime ideal p of A such that $M \subseteq p$ and each positive integer n.

The following easy result is probably well known. We refer the reader to [5] for a detailed proof.

Proposition 2.4 [5, Proposition 2.4]. *Let A be a ring. Let $I \subseteq J$ be ideals in A. Then*

$$ht(I) + ht(\frac{J}{I}) \leq ht(J).$$

Proposition 2.5. *Let A and B be k-algebras such that A is an AF-domain. Let $P \in Spec(A \otimes_k B)$, $p = P \cap A$ and $q = P \cap B$. Then*

1) $ht(P) = ht(A \otimes_k q) + ht(\dfrac{P}{A \otimes_k q})$ *[6, Lemma 1.5].*

2) $ht(P) = ht(q[t.d.(A)]) + ht(p) + ht(\dfrac{P}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q})$.

Proof. 2) As $\dfrac{P}{A \otimes_k q} \cap \dfrac{B}{q} = (\overline{0})$, $\dfrac{P}{A \otimes_k q}$ survives in $A \otimes_k k_B(q)$, where $k_B(q)$ denotes the quotient field of $\dfrac{B}{q}$, so that, applying (1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} ht(\frac{P}{A \otimes_k q}) &= ht\Big(p\Big[\text{t.d.}\Big(\frac{B}{q}\Big)\Big]\Big) + ht\Big(\frac{P/(A \otimes_k q)}{p \otimes_k \frac{B}{q}}\Big) \\ &= ht(p) + ht(\frac{P}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}), \text{ as } A \text{ is a locally Jaffard domain} \\ &\quad \text{and } p \otimes_k \frac{B}{q} \cong \frac{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}{A \otimes_k q}, \text{ by Proposition 2.2.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence $ht(P) = ht(q[\text{t.d.}(A)]) + ht(p) + ht(\dfrac{P}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q})$, as desired. $\square$

A domain A is said to be catenarian if for each chain of prime ideals $p \subseteq q$ of A,

$$ht(p) + ht(\frac{q}{p}) = ht(q) \text{ (cf. [9]).}$$

Proposition 2.6. *Let A be an AF-domain. If A is catenarian, then $\dfrac{A}{p}$ is an AF-domain for each prime ideal p of A.*

Proof. Assume that A is catenarian and fix $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$. Let $p \subseteq q \in \text{Spec}(A)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} ht(\frac{q}{p}) + \text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{q}) &= ht(q) - ht(p) + \text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{q}) \\ &= \text{t.d.}(A) - ht(p) \text{ as } A \text{ is an AF-domain} \\ &= \text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\dfrac{A}{p}$ is an AF-domain. $\square$

Let A and B be k-algebras and P be a prime ideal of $A \otimes_k B$. Let $q_0 \in \text{Spec}(B)$ such that $q_0 \subset P \cap B$. We denote by $\lambda\Big((., q_0), P\Big)$ the maximum of lengths of chains of prime ideals of $A \otimes_k B$ of the form $P_0 \subset P_1 \subset ... \subset P_s = P$ such that $P_i \cap B = q_0$, for $i = 0, 1, ..., s-1$.

Proposition 2.7 [3, Lemma 2.4]. *Let A and B be k-algebras and P be a prime ideal of $A \otimes_k B$ with $p = P \cap A$ and $q = P \cap B$. Assume that A and B are integral domains. Then*

$$\lambda\Big((.,(0)),P\Big) \leq \text{ t.d.}(A) - \text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p}) + ht\Big(q\Big[\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p})\Big]\Big) + ht(\frac{P}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}).$$

Finally, recall that, if A is a k-algebra and $n \geq 0$ is an integer, then the polynomial ring $A[n]$ is an AF-domain if and only if, for each prime ideal p of A,

$$ht(p[n]) + \text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p}) = \text{ t.d.}(A) \text{ [6, Lemma 2.1]}.$$

Next, we announce the main theorem of this paper. It gives an answer to the above-mentioned problem set in [6] as well as to the question (Q) of [5] and represents an important step towards determining a formula for $\dim(A \otimes_k B)$ when $A[n]$ is an AF-domain for some positive integer n, and B is an arbitrary k-algebra.

Theorem 2.8. *Let T be a k-algebra which is a domain and M a maximal ideal of T. Let $K = \dfrac{T}{M}$ and D be a subring of K. Let $\varphi : T \longrightarrow K$ be the canonical surjective homomorphism and $A := \varphi^{-1}(D)$. Assume that T and D are AF-domains and T_M is catenarian. Let B be an arbitrary k-algebra and let $P \in Spec(A \otimes_k B)$, $p = P \cap A$ and $q = P \cap B$. Then the following statements hold:*

1) If $M \not\subseteq p$, then

$$ht(P) = ht(p) + ht(q[t.d.(A)]) + ht(\frac{P}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}).$$

2) If $M \subseteq p$, then

$$ht(P) = ht(p) + max\Big\{ht(q_1[t.d.(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[t.d.(D)]\Big) +$$

$$min\Big(t.d.(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ t.d.(K:D)\Big) : q_1 \subseteq q \in\ Spec(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{P}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}).$$

3) $dim(A \otimes_k B) =\ max\Big\{D\Big(t.d.(A), d, B\Big); ht(M) + max\Big\{ht(q_1[t.d.(A)]) + ht\Big(\dfrac{q}{q_1}[t.d.(D)]\Big)$

$$min\Big(t.d.(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ t.d.(K:D)\Big) + min\Big(t.d.(D),\ dim(D) + t.d.(\frac{B}{q})\Big) : q_1 \subseteq q \in\ Spec(B)\Big\}\Big\},$$

where $d :=\ sup\Big\{ht(Q) : Q \in Spec(T) \text{ with } M \not\subseteq Q\Big\}$.

4) A is a GAF-domain.

Proof. 1) Let $M \not\subseteq p$. Then, by [1, Lemma 2.1], there exists $p' \in \mathrm{Spec}(T)$ such that $p' \cap A = p$, and p' satisfies $A_p = T_{p'}$. Thus A_p is an AF-domain, so that by Proposition 2.5,

$$ht(P) = ht(q[\text{t.d.}(A)]) + ht(p) + ht(\frac{P}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}), \text{ as desired.}$$

2) Assume that $M \subseteq p$. Then $\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p}) = \text{t.d.}\Big(\frac{A/M}{p/M}\Big) \leq$ t.d.(D), and applying [1, Lemma 2.1], there exists $Q \in \mathrm{Spec}(D)$ such that $p = \varphi^{-1}(Q)$ and the following diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
A_p \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & D_Q \arrow[d] \\
T_M \arrow[r] & K
\end{tikzcd}$$

is a pullback diagram. Therefore, as $ht(P) = ht(P(A_p \otimes_k B))$, we may assume without loss of generality that (T, M) is a quasilocal catenarian domain, and thus M is a divided prime ideal of A, via [1, Lemma 2.1].
First, note that, by Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.2, we have, $\forall q_1 \subseteq q \in \mathrm{Spec}(B)$,

$$\begin{cases} ht(q_1[\text{t.d.}(A)]) &= ht(A \otimes_k q_1) \\ ht\Big(p\Big[\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1})\Big]\Big) &= ht(\frac{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q_1}{A \otimes_k q_1}) \\ ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) &= ht(\frac{M \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}{M \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q_1}). \end{cases}$$

It follows, by Proposition 2.1, Proposition 2.2, Proposition 2.3 and Proposition 2.4, that, $\forall q_1 \subseteq q \in \mathrm{Spec}(B)$,

$$ht(p) + ht(q_1[\text{t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) + \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) =$$

$$ht(M) + \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) + ht(\frac{p}{M}) + ht(A \otimes_k q_1) + ht(\frac{M \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}{M \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q_1}) =$$

$$ht\Big(M\Big[\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1})\Big]\Big) + ht(A \otimes_k q_1) + ht\Big(\frac{p}{M}\Big[\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q})\Big]\Big) + ht(\frac{M \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}{M \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q_1}) =$$

$$ht(\frac{M \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q_1}{A \otimes_k q_1}) + ht(A \otimes_k q_1) + ht(\frac{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}{M \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}) + ht(\frac{M \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}{M \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q_1}) \leq$$

$$ht(p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q).$$

Therefore, for each prime ideal $q_1 \subseteq q$ of B,

$$ht(p) + ht(q_1[\text{ t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) + \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) +$$

$$ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}) \leq ht(p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q) + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}) \leq ht(P),$$

establishing the direct inequality. The proof of the reverse inequality falls into the following two steps.

Step 1. B is an integral domain.
Our argument uses induction on $\dim(T)$, $ht(p)$ and $ht(q)$. First, note that

$$(*) \qquad \max\Big\{ht(q[\text{t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(p\Big[\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q})\Big]\Big), ht(p[\text{t.d.}(B)]) + ht\Big(q\Big[\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p})\Big]\Big)\Big\} \leq$$

$$ht(p) + \max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{ t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[(\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) +$$

$$\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : q_1 \subseteq q \in \text{ Spec}(B)\Big\},$$

it suffices to take $q_1 = q$ and $q_1 = (0)$. If either $\dim(T) = 0$ or $ht(p) = 0$, then $T = K$ is a field and, thus, $A = D$ is an AF-domain, and applying Proposition 2.5 and $(*)$, we obtain the formula. Also, the case $ht(q) = 0$ is fairly easy via Proposition 2.5 and $(*)$. Then, assume that $\dim(T) > 0$, $ht(p) > 0$ and $ht(q) > 0$. Consider a chain of prime ideals $Q_0 \subset Q_1 \subset ... \subset Q_h = P$ of $A\otimes_k B$ such that $h = ht(P)$. Let $r := \max\{m : Q_m \cap A \subset p$ or $Q_m \cap B \subset q\}$. Let $Q = Q_r$, $p' = Q_r \cap A$ and $q' = Q_r \cap B$. Hence, $ht(P) = ht(Q) + ht(\frac{P}{Q})$. We are led to discuss the following cases.

Case 1. $p' = p$. Then, $q' \subset q$, and by inductive assumptions,

$$ht(Q) = ht(p) + \max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{ t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q'}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) +$$

$$\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : q_1 \subseteq q' \in \text{ Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{Q}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q'}),\ \text{and thus}$$

$$ht(P) \leq ht(p) + \max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{ t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q'}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) +$$

$$\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : q_1 \subseteq q' \in \text{ Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q'}).$$

As $\dfrac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q'} \cap \dfrac{A}{p} = (\overline{0})$, we get by Proposition 2.5,

$$\begin{aligned}
ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q'}) &= ht\Big(\frac{q}{q'}\Big[\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p})\Big]\Big) + ht\Big(\frac{P/(p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q')}{(A/p)\otimes_k (q/q')}\Big)\\
&= ht\Big(\frac{q}{q'}\Big[\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p})\Big]\Big) + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}),
\end{aligned}$$

since, by Proposition 2.2, $\dfrac{A}{p}\otimes_k \dfrac{q}{q'} \cong \dfrac{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q'}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
ht(P) \;\leq\;& ht(p) + \max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{ t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q'}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) +\\
&\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : q_1 \subseteq q' \in \ \text{Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q'}\Big[\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p})\Big]\Big) +\\
&ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q})\\
\leq\;& ht(p) + \max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{ t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q'}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q'}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) +\\
&\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}), \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : q_1 \subseteq q' \in \ \text{Spec}(B)\Big\} +\\
&ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}), \text{ as t.d.}(\frac{A}{p}) \leq \text{t.d.}(D)\\
\leq\;& ht(p) + \max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{ t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) +\\
&\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}), \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : q_1 \subseteq q \in \ \text{Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q})\\
\leq\;& ht(P).
\end{aligned}$$

Then the equality holds, as we wish to show.

Case 2. $M \subseteq p' \subset p$. By inductive hypotheses, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
ht(Q) \;=\;& ht(p') + \max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q'}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) + \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}), \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) :\\
&q_1 \subseteq q' \in \text{Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{Q}{p'\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q'}).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $ht(p') = ht(M) + ht(\dfrac{p'}{M})$ and that $\dfrac{Q}{M\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q'}$ survives in $D\otimes_k k_B(q')$, where $k_B(q')$ denotes the quotient field of $\dfrac{B}{q'}$, since $\dfrac{Q}{M\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q'} \cap \dfrac{B}{q'} = (\overline{0})$. Then, by Proposition 2.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned} ht(\frac{Q}{M\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q'}) &= ht\Big(\frac{p'}{M}\Big[\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q'})\Big]\Big) + ht(\frac{Q}{p'\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q'}) \\ &\qquad \text{since } \frac{p'}{M}\otimes_k \frac{B}{q'} \cong \frac{p'\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q'}{M\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q'}, \text{ by Proposition 2.2} \\ &= ht(\frac{p'}{M}) + ht(\frac{Q}{p'\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q'}) \text{ as } D \text{ is an AF-domain.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} ht(Q) &= ht(M)+\max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q'}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big)+\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}), \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : \\ &\qquad q_1 \subseteq q' \in \text{Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{Q}{M\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q'}). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} ht(P) &\le ht(M)+\max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q'}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big)+\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}), \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : \\ &\qquad q_1 \subseteq q' \in \text{Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{P}{M\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q'}) \\ &= ht(M)+\max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q'}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big)+\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}), \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : \\ &\qquad q_1 \subseteq q' \in \text{Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q'}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) + ht(\frac{p}{M}) + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}), \\ &\qquad \text{by Proposition 2.5, since } D \text{ is an AF-domain, and since, by Proposition 2.2,} \\ &\qquad \frac{p}{M}\otimes_k \frac{B}{q'} + \frac{A}{M}\otimes_k \frac{q}{q'} \cong \frac{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}{M\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q'} \\ &\le ht(p)+\max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big)+\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}), \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : \\ &\qquad q_1 \subseteq q \in \text{Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}) \\ &\le ht(P), \text{ as desired.} \end{aligned}$$

Case 3. $p' \subset M$ and $q' \neq (0)$. Then $A_{p'}$ is an AF-domain, and thus $ht(Q) = ht(A\otimes_k q') + ht(\frac{Q}{A\otimes_k q'})$, so that $ht(P) = ht(A\otimes_k q') + ht(\frac{P}{A\otimes_k q'})$. As $ht(\frac{q}{q'}) < ht(q)$, we get, by inductive assumptions,

$$\begin{aligned} ht(\frac{P}{A\otimes_k q'}) = ht(p) + \max\Big\{ht\Big(\frac{q_1}{q'}[\text{t.d.}(A)]\Big) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big)+ \\ \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}), \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : q' \subseteq q_1 \subseteq q \in \text{Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
ht(P) \;&=\; ht(p)+\max\Big\{ht(q'[\text{t.d.}(A)])+ht\Big(\frac{q_1}{q'}[\ \text{t.d.}(A)]\Big)+ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big)+\\
&\qquad \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : q' \subseteq q_1 \subseteq q \in \ \text{Spec}(B)\Big\}+\\
&\qquad ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q})\\
&\leq\; ht(p)+\max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{t.d.}(A)])+ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big)+\\
&\qquad \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : q_1 \subseteq q \in \ \text{Spec}(B)\Big\}+ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q})\\
&\leq\; ht(P), \text{ and the equality holds.}
\end{aligned}$$

Case 4. $(0) \neq p' \subset M$ and $q' = (0)$. Then $ht(Q) = ht(p'\otimes_k B) + ht(\frac{Q}{p'\otimes_k B})$, via Proposition 2.5. It follows that $ht(P) = ht(p') + ht(\frac{P}{p'\otimes_k B})$, as $A_{p'}$ is an AF-domain. Since $p' \subset M$, there exists a unique prime ideal P' of T such that $P' \cap A = p'$. Then $P' \neq (0)$, so that $\dim(\frac{T}{P'}) < \dim(T)$, and

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\frac{A}{p'} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & D \arrow[d] \\
\frac{T}{P'} \arrow[r] & K \cong \frac{T/P'}{M/P'}
\end{tikzcd}$$

is a pullback diagram. Moreover, by Proposition 2.6, $\frac{T}{P'}$ is an AF-domain which is catenarian, therefore, by inductive assumptions, we get

$$ht(\frac{P}{p'\otimes_k B}) = ht(\frac{p}{p'}) + \max\Big\{ht\Big(q_1\Big[\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p'})\Big]\Big)+ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big)+$$

$$\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : q_1 \subseteq q \in \ \text{Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht\Big(\frac{P/(p'\otimes_k B)}{p/p'\otimes_k B + A/p'\otimes_k q}\Big)$$

$$= ht(\frac{p}{p'}) + \max\Big\{ht\Big(q_1\Big[\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p'})\Big]\Big)+ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big)+$$

$$\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : q_1 \subseteq q \in \ \text{Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
ht(P) &= ht(p') + ht(\frac{p}{p'}) + \max\Big\{ht\Big(q_1\Big[\text{ t.d.}(\frac{A}{p'})\Big]\Big) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) + \\
&\quad \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}), \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : q_1 \subseteq q \in \text{ Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}) \\
&\leq ht(p) + \max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{ t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) + \\
&\quad \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}), \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : q_1 \subseteq q \in \text{ Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}) \\
&\leq h(P).
\end{aligned}$$

Then the equality holds.

Case 5. $p' = (0)$ and $q' = (0)$. Then, by [19, Theorem 3.1], $ht(Q) \leq \text{t.d.}(B)$, and thus, as $Q_{r+1} \cap A = p$ and $Q_{r+1} \cap B = q$, we get

$$ht(P) = ht(Q_{r+1}) + ht(\frac{P}{Q_{r+1}}) \leq 1 + \text{t.d.}(B) + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}).$$

Suppose that $1+\text{t.d.}(B) \leq ht(p[\text{t.d.}(B)])$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
ht(P) &\leq ht(p[\text{t.d.}(B)]) + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}) \\
&\leq ht(p[\text{t.d.}(B)]) + ht\Big(q\Big[\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p})\Big]\Big) + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}) \\
&= ht(p\otimes_k B) + ht(\frac{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}{p\otimes_k B}) + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}) \\
&\leq ht(P).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence $ht(p[\text{t.d.}(B)]) = ht(p[\text{t.d.}(B)]) + ht\Big(q\Big[\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p})\Big]\Big)$, so that $q = (0)$ which leads to a contradiction, as $ht(q) > 0$. It follows that, by Proposition 2.3,

$$1+\text{t.d.}(B) > ht(p[\text{t.d.}(B)]) = ht(p)+\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(B),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big), \text{ so that}$$

$$\text{t.d.}(B) > \text{t.d.}(K:D), \text{ as } ht(p) \geq 1. \text{ On the other hand,}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
ht(P) &= ht(Q_{r+1}) + ht(\frac{P}{Q_{r+1}}) \\
&= \lambda\Big(\Big((0),(0)\Big), Q_{r+1}\Big) + ht(\frac{P}{Q_{r+1}}) \\
&\leq \text{t.d.}(A) - \text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p}) + ht\Big(q\Big[\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p})\Big]\Big) + ht(\frac{Q_{r+1}}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}) + ht(\frac{P}{Q_{r+1}}) \\
&\quad \text{(cf. Proposition 2.7)} \\
&\leq ht(p[\text{t.d.}(K:D)]) + ht\Big(q\Big[\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p})\Big]\Big) + ht(\frac{P}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}), \\
&\quad \text{as } A[\text{t.d.}(K:D)] \text{ is an AF-domain} \\
&\leq ht(p[\text{t.d.}(B)]) + ht\Big(q[\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p})]\Big) + ht(\frac{P}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}) \\
\leq\ & ht(p) + \max\Big\{ht(q_1[\ \text{t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) + \\
& \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}), \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : q_1 \subseteq q \in \ \text{Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{P}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}), \\
& \text{by } (*) \\
\leq\ & ht(P).
\end{aligned}$$

Then the equality holds.

Step 2. B is an arbitrary k-algebra.

Let $P_0 \subset P_1 \subset ... \subset P_h = P$ be a chain of prime ideals of $A \otimes_k B$ such that $h = ht(P)$. Let $q_0 := P_0 \cap B$. Then

$$\frac{P_0}{A \otimes_k q_0} \subset \frac{P_0}{A \otimes_k q_0} \subset \frac{P_1}{A \otimes_k q_0} \subset ... \subset \frac{P_h}{A \otimes_k q_0} = \frac{P}{A \otimes_k q_0}$$

is a chain of prime ideals of $A \otimes_k \dfrac{B}{q_0}$ and $h = ht(P) = ht(\dfrac{P}{A \otimes_k q_0})$. By Step 1,

$$\begin{aligned}
ht(P) \quad = \quad & ht(\frac{P}{A \otimes_k q_0}) = ht(p) + \max\Big\{ht\Big(\frac{q_1}{q_0}[\ \text{t.d.}(A)]\Big) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) + \\
& \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : q_0 \subseteq q_1 \subseteq q \in \ \text{Spec}(B)\Big\} + \\
& ht\Big(\frac{P/(A \otimes_k q_0)}{p \otimes_k (B/q_0) + A \otimes_k (q/q_0)}\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq ht(p) + \max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{ t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) + \\
&\quad \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : q_1 \subseteq q \in \text{ Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}) \\
&\leq ht(P),\ \text{then the equality holds establishing the desired formula.}
\end{aligned}$$

3) First, observe that, by [1, Lemma 2.1], for each $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ such that $M \not\subset p$, there exists a unique $Q \in \text{Spec}(T)$ such that $Q \cap A = p$, and Q satisfies $A_p = T_Q$. Then $d = \max\Big\{ht(p) : p \in \text{Spec}(A) \text{ with } M \not\subset p\Big\}$. Now, by (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max\Big\{ht(P) : P \in \text{Spec}(A\otimes_k B) \text{ and } M \not\subset p := P \cap A\Big\} = \\
&\max\Big\{ht(p) + ht(q[\text{t.d.}(A)]) + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}) : P \in \text{Spec}(A\otimes_k B) \text{ with } p = P\cap A, \\
&\qquad q = P \cap B \text{ such that } M \not\subset p\Big\} = \\
&\max\Big\{ht(p) + ht(q[\text{t.d.}(A)]) + \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p}),\ \text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q})\Big) : p \in \text{Spec}(A) \text{ and } q \in \text{Spec}(B) \\
&\qquad \text{such that } M \not\subset p\Big\} \text{ (cf. [20, Proposition 2.3])} = \\
&\max\Big\{ht(q[\text{t.d.}(A)]) + \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(A), ht(p) + \text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q})\Big) : p \in \text{Spec}(A) \text{ with } M \not\subset p \text{ and} \\
&\qquad q \in \text{Spec}(B)\Big\} \text{ (as } A_p \text{ is an AF-domain)} = \\
&\max\Big\{ht(q[\text{t.d.}(A)]) + \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(A), d + \text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q})\Big) : q \in \text{Spec}(B)\Big\} = D\Big(\text{t.d.}(A), d, B\Big) \ (**).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, let $M \subseteq p$. As done in (2), we may assume that (T, M) is a quasilocal domain, and thus M is a divided prime ideal of A. First, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
ht(p) + \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p}),\ \text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q})\Big) &= ht(M) + ht(\frac{p}{M}) + \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p}),\ \text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q})\Big) \\
&= ht(M) + \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(D), ht(\frac{p}{M}) + \text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q})\Big), \text{ as } D \text{ is} \\
&\quad\ \text{an AF-domain.}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (2),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max\Big\{ht(P) : P \in \text{Spec}(A\otimes_k B) \text{ and } M \subseteq p := P \cap A\Big\} = \\
&\max\Big\{ht(p) + \max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) + \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : \\
&q_1 \subseteq q \in \text{ Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B + A\otimes_k q}) : P \in \text{ Spec}(A\otimes_k B) \text{ with } p = P\cap A \text{ and} \\
&\qquad\qquad q = P \cap B \text{ such that } M \subseteq p\Big\} =
\end{aligned}$$

$$\max\Big\{ht(p)+ht(q_1[\text{t.d.}(A)])+ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big)+\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big)+$$

$$\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p}),\ \text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q})\Big):p\in\ \text{Spec}(A)\text{ and }q_1\subseteq q\in\ \text{Spec}(B)\text{ such that }M\subseteq p\Big\}=$$

$$\max\Big\{ht(M)+ht(q_1[\text{t.d.}(A)])+ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big)+\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big)+$$

$$\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(D),ht(\frac{p}{M})+\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q})\Big):p\in\ \text{Spec}(A)\text{ and }q_1\subseteq q\in\ \text{Spec}(B)\text{ such that }M\subseteq p\Big\}=$$

$$\max\Big\{ht(M)+ht(q_1[\text{t.d.}(A)])+ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big)+\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big)+$$

$$\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(D),\ \dim(D)+\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q})\Big):q_1\subseteq q\in\ \text{Spec}(B)\Big\}\ (***).$$

Consequently, combining $(**)$ and $(***)$, we get easily the desired formula for $\dim(A\otimes_k B)$.

4) Let $p\in\text{Spec}(A)$ and $q\in\text{Spec}(B)$. Let Q be a minimal prime ideal of $p\otimes_k B+A\otimes_k q$. Assume that $M\not\subseteq p$. Then, by (1), $ht(Q)=ht(p)+ht(q[\text{t.d.}(A)])$. Therefore,

$$ht(p\otimes_k B+A\otimes_k q)=ht(p)+ht(q[\text{t.d.}(A)])$$

and for any $P\in\text{Spec}(A\otimes_k B)$ with $p=P\cap A$ and $q=P\cap B$, via (1),

$$ht(P)=ht(p\otimes_k B+A\otimes_k q)+ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B+A\otimes_k q}).$$

Now, let $M\subseteq p$. Then, by (2),

$$ht(Q)=ht(p)+\max\Big\{ht(q_1[\ \text{t.d.}(A)])+ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big)+\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big):$$

$$q_1\subseteq q\in\ \text{Spec}(B)\Big\},\text{ so that}$$

$$ht(p\otimes_k B+A\otimes_k q)=ht(p)+\max\Big\{ht(q_1[\ \text{t.d.}(A)])+ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big)+$$

$$\min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}),\ \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big):q_1\subseteq q\in\ \text{Spec}(B)\Big\}.$$

Thus, via (2), $ht(P)=ht(p\otimes_k B+A\otimes_k q)+ht(\frac{P}{p\otimes_k B+A\otimes_k q})$ for each $P\in\text{Spec}(A\otimes_k B)$ such that $p=P\cap A$ and $q=P\cap B$. Therefore A is a GAF-domain, completing the proof. $\square$

We get the following interesting consequence of Theorem 2.8.

Corollary 2.9. *Let T be a k-algebra which is a domain and M a maximal ideal of T. Let $K = \dfrac{T}{M}$ and D be a subring of K. Let $\varphi : T \longrightarrow K$ be the canonical surjective homomorphism and $A := \varphi^{-1}(D)$. Assume that T and D are AF-domains and $ht(M) \leq 2$. Then, the assertions (1), (2), (3) and (4) of Theorem 2.8 hold for A and any k-algebra B.*

Proof. It is direct from Theorem 2.8 since any two-dimensional domain is catenarian. □

The following result discusses a case where it is possible to drop the catenarity assumption of T_M in Theorem 2.8.

Proposition 2.10. *Let T be a k-algebra which is a domain and M a maximal ideal of T. Let $K = \dfrac{T}{M}$ and D be a subring of K. Let $\varphi : T \longrightarrow K$ be the canonical surjective homomorphism and $A := \varphi^{-1}(D)$. Assume that T and D are AF-domains and t.d.$(K : D) \leq 2$. Then, the assertions (1), (2), (3) and (4) of Theorem 2.8 hold for A and any k-algebra B.*

Proof. The proof runs similar to that of Theorem 2.8. We need only to discuss the case where $(0) \neq p' \subset M$ and $q' = (0)$ (Case 4 of Step 1 of the above proof) where the catenarity property of T is required. So, let B be an integral domain and let $P \in \text{Spec}(A \otimes_k B)$, $p = P \cap A$ and $q = P \cap B$. Let $r := \max\{m : Q_m \cap A \subset p \text{ or } Q_m \cap B \subset q\}$. Let $Q = Q_r$, $p' = Q_r \cap A$ and $q' = Q_r \cap B$, and suppose that $(0) \neq p' \subset M$ and $q' = (0)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
ht(P) &= ht(Q_{r+1}) + ht(\frac{P}{Q_{r+1}}) \\
&= \lambda\Big((., (0)), Q_{r+1}\Big) + ht(\frac{P}{Q_{r+1}}) \\
&\leq \text{t.d.}(A) - \text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p}) + ht\Big(q[\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p})]\Big) + ht(\frac{Q_{r+1}}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}) + ht(\frac{P}{Q_{r+1}}), \\
&\quad \text{ by Proposition 2.7} \\
&\leq ht(p[\text{t.d.}(K : D)]) + ht\Big(q[\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p})]\Big) + ht(\frac{P}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}), \text{ as } A[\text{t.d.}(K : D)] \text{ is} \\
&\quad \text{an AF-domain, by Proposition 2.3.}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, if t.d.$(B) \geq 2$, then we get

$$\begin{aligned}
ht(P) &\leq ht(p[\text{t.d.}(B)]) + ht\Big(q[\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p})]\Big) + ht(\frac{P}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}) \\
&\leq ht(p) + \max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{ t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) + \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}), \text{t.d.}(K : D)\Big) : \\
&\quad q_1 \subseteq q \in \text{ Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{P}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}) \\
&\leq ht(P),
\end{aligned}$$

so that the desired equality holds. Assume that t.d.$(B) \leq 1$. Then B is an AF-domain. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} ht(P) &= ht(p[\text{t.d.}(B)]) + ht\Big(q[\text{t.d.}(\frac{A}{p})]\Big) + ht(\frac{P}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}), \text{ by Proposition 2.5} \\ &\leq ht(p) + \max\Big\{ht(q_1[\text{ t.d.}(A)]) + ht\Big(\frac{q}{q_1}[\text{t.d.}(D)]\Big) + \min\Big(\text{t.d.}(\frac{B}{q_1}), \text{t.d.}(K:D)\Big) : \\ &\quad q_1 \subseteq q \in \text{ Spec}(B)\Big\} + ht(\frac{P}{p \otimes_k B + A \otimes_k q}) \\ &\leq ht(P). \end{aligned}$$

Then the equality holds, as contended. □

Next, for each positive integer n, we provide an example of a finite dimensional valuation domain (V, M), thus universally catenarian (cf. [18]), of Krull dimension n such that V is an AF-domain. Then, given any subring D of $K := \frac{V}{M}$ such that D is an AF-domain (in particular any subfield of K), Theorem 2.8 allows us to compute $\dim(A \otimes_k B)$ for any k-algebra B, where A is the pullback $\varphi^{-1}(D)$.

Example 2.11. Let $V_1 = k(X_1, X_2, ..., X_n)[Y]_{(Y)} = k(X_1, X_2, ...X_n) + M_1$ be a rank-one discrete valuation domain with $M_1 := YV_1$. Let

$$V_2 = k(X_1, X_2, ..., X_{n-1})[X_n]_{(X_n)} + M_1 = k(X_1, X_2, ..., X_{n-1}) + M_2$$

with $M_2 := M_1 + X_n k(X_1, ..., X_{n-1})[X_n]_{(X_n)}$. It is well known that V_2 is a valuation domain of (Krull) dimension 2 [11, Exercise 13 (2), page 203]. Also, by [12], V_2 is an AF-domain. Let

$$V_3 = k(X_1, X_2, ..., X_{n-2})[X_{n-1}]_{(X_{n-1})} + M_2 = k(X_1, X_2, ..., X_{n-2}) + M_3$$

with $M_3 := M_2 + X_{n-1} k(X_1, ..., X_{n-2})[X_{n-1}]_{(X_{n-1})}$. Then V_3 is a valuation domain of dimension 3 which is an AF-domain. We may iterate this process to construct a valuation domain of the form $V = K + M$ which is an AF-domain of dimension r for each positive integer r. □

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank the referee for his/her helpful suggestions.

References

[1] D. F. Anderson, A. Bouvier, D. E. Dobbs, M. Fontana, and S. Kabbaj, *On Jaffard domains*, Exposition. Math. 6 (2) (1988) 145-175.

[2] S. Bouchiba, *On Krull dimension of tensor products of algebras arising from AF-domains*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 203 (2005) 237-251.

[3] S. Bouchiba, *Chains of prime ideals in tensor products of algebras*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 209 (2007) 621-630.

[4] S. Bouchiba, *AF-domains and Jaffard's special chain theorem*, The Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering, Vol. 30, n: 2A, (2005), 1-7.

[5] S. Bouchiba, *AF-domains and their generalizations*, Comm. Algebra, to appear.

[6] S. Bouchiba, F. Girolami, and S. Kabbaj, *The dimension of tensor products of k-algebras arising from pullbacks*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 137 (1999), 125-138.

[7] S. Bouchiba and S. Kabbaj, *Tensor products of Cohen-Macaulay rings: Solution to a problem of Grothendieck*, J. Algebra 252 (2002) 65-73.

[8] S. Bouchiba, D. Dobbs, and S. Kabbaj, *On the prime ideal structure of tensor products of algebras*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 176 (2002), 89-112.

[9] A. Bouvier, D. Dobbs and M. Fontana, *Universally catenarian integral domains*, Adv. Math. 72 (1988), 211-238.

[10] J.W. Brewer, P.R. Montgomery, E.A. Rutter, W.J. Heinzer, *Krull dimension of polynomial rings*, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 311, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, NY, 1972, 26-45.

[11] R. Gilmer, *Multiplicative ideal theory*, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1972.

[12] F. Girolami, *AF-Rings and locally Jaffard Rings*, Lecture Notes Pure Appl. Math., Vol. 153. New York: Dekker, 1994, 151-161.

[13] A. Grothendieck, *Eléments de géométrie algébrique*, Vol. IV, Institut des Hautes Etudes Sci. Publ. Math. No. 24, Bures-sur-Yvette, 1965.

[14] P. Jaffard, *Théorie de la dimension dans les anneaux de polynômes*, Mém. Sc. Math. 146, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1960.

[15] I. Kaplansky, *Commutative rings*, Chicago University Press, 1974.

[16] H. Matsumura, *Commutative ring theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1986.

[17] M. Nagata, *Local rings*, Interscience, New York, 1962.

[18] M. Nagata, *Finitely generated rings over a valuation domain*, J. Math. Kyoto Univ. 5 (1966), 163-169.

[19] R.Y. Sharp, *The dimension of the tensor product of two field extensions*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 9 (1977), 42-48.

[20] A.R. Wadsworth, *The Krull dimension of tensor products of commutative algebras over a field*, J. London Math. Soc. 19 (1979), 391-401.

[21] O. Zariski and P. Samuel, *Commutative algebra Vol. II*, Van Nostrand, Princeton, 1960.